

News

A Delhi court has ordered activists and writer Paranjoy Guha Thakurta to refrain from writing disparaging articles about Adani Gautam Adani's company.

The activists and journalists filed a defamation lawsuit, claiming that some of them sided with anti-Indian forces in order to harm the company and the Indian brand.

On Saturday, a Delhi court issued an **ex parte** interim injunction prohibiting the publication of defamatory content against Gautam Adani's Adani Enterprises Limited (AEL) by journalists ***Paranjoy Guha Thakurta, Ravi Nair, Abir Dasgupta, Ayaskant Das, Ayush Joshi, and others.***

The removal of online defamatory content was ordered by senior civil judge Anuj Kumar Singh of the Rohini Court.

"Defendants no. 1 through 10 are also directed to expunge such defamatory material from their respective articles/social media posts/tweets to the extent that they are incorrect, unverified, and prima facie defamatory, and if that is not feasible, remove them within 5 days of the date of this order," the Court ruled.

In a defamation lawsuit, Adani Enterprises claimed that specific journalists, activists, and organizations had harmed the company's reputation and cost its stakeholders billions of dollars, severely harming India's image, brand equity, and credibility as a nation.

These journalists and activists have "aligned with anti-India interests and have been continuously targeting Adani Enterprises' infrastructure and energy projects which are critical to India's infrastructure and energy security and have disrupted these projects with ulterior motives," according to the court order, Adani

Enterprises said.

"It is further stated that Due to the interference of such reporters, activists, and organizations, Adani's Australian operations aimed at securing vital resources for India were strained, delayed, and repeatedly hindered, pushing back development timelines. Their defamatory actions also caused the Adani Group's balance sheets to be strained and key investment plans to be delayed," AEL told the Court.

Referring to the Hindenburg report, which predicted a 90% drop in the value of Adani's stock and raised concerns about the company's debt, Adani Enterprises stated that the attempts to damage the AEL's reputation internationally have repeatedly hampered its ability to raise capital, delaying development timelines by years.

Citing articles on paranjoy.in, adaniwatch.org, and adanifiles.com.au, AEL claimed that these websites have consistently posted disparaging information about the Adani Group, the company, and its founder and chairman, Gautam Adani.

The Court determined that AEL had presented a prima facie case for the issuance of an interim injunction after reviewing the case.

Nonetheless, it stated that it is also mindful of the fundamental right to free speech, which is protected by Article 19 (1) (a) of the Indian Constitution.

At this point, the Court stated, "it would suffice the interest of justice to restrain defendants no. 1 to 10 from publishing/distributing/circulating unverified, unsubstantiated, and ex-facie defamatory reports about the plaintiff allegedly tarnishing the plaintiff's reputation until the next date of hearing, instead of issuing a blanket order on restraining defendants no. 1 to 9 from fair, verified, and substantiated reporting and from hosting, storing, and circulating such articles/posts/URLs."

Adani Enterprises Limited was represented by Senior Advocate Jagdeep Sharma, as well as attorneys Vijay Aggarwal, Guneet Sidhu, **Verdaan Jain**, **Muskan Aggarwal**, and Deepak Aggarwal.